



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/809,312	03/16/2001	Jon L. Cook	08049.0004	5392
22852	7590	03/24/2006	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			CHARLES, DEBRA F	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3624		

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/809,312	COOK ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Debra F. Charles	3624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-148 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-148 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/1/04, 6/25/04.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Claim Objections***

1. Claims 16, 17, 43, 53, 54, 56, 58, 76, 77, 113, 114, 116, and 118 objected to because of the following informalities: the claims reference an existing invention from the U.S. Postal Service. Inventor needs to include claims that reference only the applicant's invention and not an existing invention. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-148 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginter et al.(5910987A), Shen(2003/0187951A1), Olivier(6480885 B1), King et al.(2002/0002590A1), Ensel et al.(6493685B1), Cordery et al.(5796841A), and Hilt et al.(6032133A).

Ginter et al. discloses secure electronic services to users on a network, encryption and digital signature(Fig. 5B, 7, 10, col. 1, line 45-col. 47, line 65). Ginter et al. fail to teach advertisement message from service provider. However, Vacon et al. does teach advertisement from service provider(Abstract, claim 29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the

Applicant's invention was made to modify the teachings of Ginter et al. to include the step of advertisement from service provider. The motivation to combine these references is to obtain the network address of the provider from the advertisement.

Both Ginter et al. and Vacon et al. fail to teach filtering. However, Olivier does teach filtering(Abstract, col. 3, line 5-col.4, line 10. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the Applicant's invention was made to modify the teachings of Ginter et al. and Vacon et al. to include the step of filtering. The motivation to combine these references is to selectively read only certain emails and not others.

Ginter et al., Vacon et al. and Olivier fail to teach electronic postmark and message. However, Cordery et al. does teach electronic postmark and message(Abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the Applicant's invention was made to modify the teachings of Ginter et al., Vacon et al. and Olivier to include the step of electronic postmark and message. The motivation to combine these references is to affix an electronic postage to a message.

Ginter et al., Vacon et al., Olivier and Cordery fail to teach electronic bill payment(Abstract). However, Hilt et al. does teach electronic bill payment. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the Applicant's invention was made to modify the teachings of Ginter et al., Vacon et al., Olivier and Cordery to include the step of electronic bill payment. The motivation to combine these references is to facilitate faster bill payment.

Ginter et al., Vacon et al., Olivier and Cordery fail to teach electronic mailbox. However, Shen does teach electronic mailbox(title, Abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the Applicant's invention was made to modify the teachings of Ginter et al., Vacon et al., Olivier and Cordery to include the step of electronic mailbox. The motivation to combine these references is to store electronic mail.

Ginter et al., Vacon et al., Olivier, Cordery and Shen fail to teach associating electronic mail address with physical address. However, King et al. does teach associating electronic mail address with physical address(Abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the Applicant's invention was made to modify the teachings of Ginter et al., Vacon et al., Olivier, Cordery and Shen to include the step of associating electronic mail address with physical address. The motivation to combine these references is to associate an electronic address with a physical address.

Ginter et al., Vacon et al., Olivier, Cordery, Shen and King et al. fail to teach electronic bill formatting. However, Ensel et al. does teach electronic bill formatting(Abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the Applicant's invention was made to modify the teachings of Ginter et al., Vacon et al., Olivier, Cordery, Shen and King et al. to include the step of electronic bill formatting. The motivation to combine these references is to format electronic bills to match what the merchant prefers.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Debra F. Charles whose telephone number is (571) 272 6791. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5 Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent A. Millin can be reached on (571) 272 6747. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Debra F. Charles  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3624

\*\*\*



VINCENT MILLIN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600